

CLASSIFICATION <del>RESTRICTED</del> SECURITY INFORMATION		REPORT	50X1-HUM
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY INFORMATION FROM FOREIGN DOCUMENTS OR RADIO BROADCASTS		CD NO.	
COUNTRY	USSR	DATE OF INFORMATION	1953
SUBJECT	Scientific - Biology, genetics Economic - Agriculture	DATE DIST.	3 Jun 1953
HOW PUBLISHED	Bimonthly periodical	NO. OF PAGES	3
WHERE PUBLISHED	Moscow	SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT	50X1-HUM
DATE PUBLISHED	Feb 1953		50X1-HUM
LANGUAGE	Russian		

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF ESPIONAGE ACT 50 U. S. C. 31 AND 32, AS AMENDED. ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW. REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED.

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

SOURCE Zhurnal Obshchey Biologii, Vol XIV, No 1, 1953, pp 3-22REPLY TO USSR CRITICISM OF LYSENKO'S TEACHING

N. I. Nuzhdin

[Comment: The following article, published under the title "Reversion to Weismannism Under the Banner of the Defense of Darwinism" in Zhurnal Obshchey Biologii, Vol XIV, No 1, 1953, is a reply to articles by N.V. Turbin and N.D. Ivanov in Botanicheskiy Zhurnal, Vol XXXVII, No 6, 1952, which rather sharply criticized T.D. Lysenko's views on the origin and formation of species.

50X1-HUM

N.I. Nuzhdin is deputy chief editor of Zhurnal Obshchey Biologii.

Reactionary science declared a war against Darwinism while Darwin was still alive. Although conditions produced by the class struggle [in capitalistic countries] did not result in an outright prohibition of Darwinism, everything that was progressive in Darwin's theory was eliminated. On the other hand, all errors contained in Darwin's theory (use of the reactionary theory of Malthus to explain the evolutionary process, overvaluation of the influence of living conditions on this process, and assumption of the indeterminate [arbitrary] character of modifications occurring in an overexpanded species, etc.) were propagandized by the Neo-Darwinists (Weismannists) and presented as Darwin's real teaching.

The rout of Neo-Darwinism (i.e., of the theories of Weismann, Mendel, and Morgan) in the USSR was of decisive importance for the development of science. The refutation of Darwin's conception of the role of intraspecies struggle in evolution has freed Darwinism from Malthusian errors and must therefore be regarded as a signal achievement of materialistic science.

In rejecting Lysenko's views on the sudden appearance of new species, N.D. Ivanov (1) shows by his treatment of the subject that he does not adhere to the correct Marxist understanding of evolution as a process which must necessarily lead to sudden qualitative changes. In his attempts to prove that Lysenko's

- 1 -

CLASSIFICATION		<del>RESTRICTED</del>		DISTRIBUTION								
STATE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NAVY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSRB										
ARMY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AIR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FBI										

RESTRICTED

50X1-HUM

views are in conflict with Darwinism, Ivanov quotes Lysenko's report "On the Situation in Biological Science." To begin with, Ivanov passes in silence over the fact that this report has been approved by the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Furthermore, he quotes the text of the report to suit his argument, and omits statements which show that Lysenko does not at all subscribe to the catastrophic or cataclysmal theory.

The policy of the editors of Botanicheskiy Zhurnal in publishing the article by Ivanov and the article by N.V. Turbin which appears in the same issue is difficult to understand. No matter what the editors' approach to the biological aspects of species formation may be, it is their duty to defend the philosophy of Marxism against distortion.

Turbin and Ivanov not only do not understand the role of Michurin's teaching, which strives to free Darwinism of errors and has already freed it of Malthusian errors (cf. Lysenko's report made at the 1948 Session of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences imeni V.I. Lenin), they also attempt to push Michurin's biology back into the arms of reactionary Neo-Darwinism. How else can one interpret Turbin's statement to the effect that Darwin's views on the origin of species do not contradict dialectical materialism? Turbin knows perfectly well that Darwin's teaching subscribes to the principle of divergence, and that the idea of divergence in turn follows from the Malthusian concepts of overpopulation and intraspecies struggle.

Knowing how strongly the Soviet community reacts against Weismannism and Morganism, Ivanov accuses Lysenko of being a follower of Morgan. In his paper, Ivanov says that there are many points of agreement between Lysenko and the adherents of the Morgan-Weismann school. Thus, according to Ivanov, both Lysenko and the members of this reactionary school deny the effects of overpopulation and of the intraspecies struggle. Ivanov supports this statement by quotations from Morgan's writings, so that readers who are not quite familiar with the subject may very well be misled. Actually, the Neo-Darwinists have accepted overpopulation together with the intraspecies struggle and the principle of arbitrary modifications, but have rejected every constructive aspect of Darwin's theory. Ivanov believes, just as the Neo-Darwinists, that the concepts of overpopulation and intraspecies struggle are essential for an understanding of the phenomenon of natural selection. In other words, Ivanov rather than Lysenko is on the side of the Morganists. At one time Professor Turbin, who at present agrees with Ivanov, stated that reactionary Malthusianism should be combated and referred to it as a harmful expression of bourgeois and imperialistic science (3). This is something that Ivanov and certain other people, particularly the editors of Botanicheskiy Zhurnal, must not forget. It is time to stop the advocacy of reactionary Malthusianism, which is carried on both by word of mouth and in writing.

Turbin deplores the fact that Lysenko's new theory (as he [Turbin] calls it) has been introduced into programs of study and textbooks without adequate discussion and criticism (2). However, Turbin himself was for a great number of years a member of the Expert Commission on Biology, and in that capacity participated in confirming programs of study which dealt with Darwinism. During all these years, I have not heard the slightest objection from him. Furthermore, the data of V.K. Karapetyan on the transformation of hard wheat into soft wheat have been outlined without any critical comments in Turbin's own textbook (4). There Turbin does not explain this transformation by hybridization, as he does now in Botanicheskiy Zhurnal. On the contrary, he says in his textbook: "Thus, experimental data prove the possibility of transformation of one species of wheat into another." The fact that Turbin has changed his views now is a private matter between himself and his conscience as a scientist. Under the circumstances he certainly does not have the right to reproach anyone with monopolistic tendencies in science.

- 2 -

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

50X1-HUM

Assertions by Turbin and Ivanov (1,2) that Lysenko negates Darwin's theory of evolution and regards it as metaphysical must be designated sheer libel. Lysenko does not even claim that he has advanced a new theory of species; this is an invention by Turbin and Ivanov. Only Ivanov may think that a defense of Darwinism implies a defense of Darwin's errors. Darwinism does not hinge on the theory of the origin and formation of species; there is more to Darwin's theory than that.

It does not matter whether Darwinism recognizes the existence of border lines between species, or whether or not it negates qualitative changes in nature. What does matter is how the formation of border lines is explained. Darwinism does not give a correct explanation, while Michurinist science does. This is not clear to the critics of Michurin's theory, who try to resurrect an error that has been committed by Darwinism. Michurinist biological science has proven by incontrovertible facts that acquired characteristics are inherited. It has refuted forever the concept of arbitrary modifications and has substituted for it the idea that modifications represent a definite rigidly determined response to the environment. Only Neo-Darwinists believe that haphazard modifications arise independently of the influences exerted by the environment, and that the viable modifications among them survive, while the others die. Turbin's views are in agreement with this theory, but they have nothing in common with Michurinist science.

If we accept Turbin's and Ivanov's theoretical assumptions, we will necessarily disregard important facts that have a bearing on the breeding of hard winter wheats and on other useful work. Turbin's ideas in regard to the multiplicity of father strains which cross simultaneously with a single mother strain and on the tendency of father strains to separate out in subsequent generations will not help. V.K. Karapet'yan's findings that the Ferrugineum, Milturum, Cinereum, Erythrospermum, Lutescens, Pseudolutescens, and Cesium varieties develop as a result of the transformation of hard wheat into soft wheat cannot be explained by Turbin's hybridization theory.

Ivanov and Turbin have undertaken the thankless task of liquidating the principal achievements of Michurinist science and of turning this science back to Neo-Darwinism and Malthusianism. Furthermore, they are guilty of vulgarization of the Marxist-Leninist theory of evolution and of attempts to justify Darwinism by equating it to dialectical materialism. The rout of Morganism and the victory of Michurinist science have led to complacency among biologists, so that insufficient attention has been paid to the unmasking of Weismannist and Morganist tendencies. This has resulted in the following objectionable phenomenon: under the guise of criticism, certain biologists began to introduce into science views which are foreign to science. Under the circumstances, it is our duty to safeguard the purity of theory by exposing all reactionary tendencies which attempt to penetrate into our science.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. N.D. Ivanov, "Concerning N.D. Lysenko's New Theory of Species," Botanicheskiy Zhurnal, Vol XXXVII, No 6, 1952, pp 819-842
2. N.V. Turbin, "Darwinism and the New Theory of Species," Botanicheskiy Zhurnal, Vol XXXVII, No 6, 1952, pp 798-818
3. N.V. Turbin, Literaturnaya Gazeta, No 62 (2377), 10 Dec 1947
4. N.V. Turbin, Genetika s Osnovami Seleksii (Genetics and the Fundamentals of Selection), p 285, published by Sovetskaya Nauka, 1950

- E N D -

- 3 -

RESTRICTED